



counsel in these consolidated actions, which include a putative class action on behalf of all STU residents.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, all STU residents share identical interests with the represented parties. Accordingly, the Court will not consider the pro se motion.

Moreover, if—as Movants suggest—their motion was treated as an amicus filing, it is entirely within the Court’s discretion whether to consider the submission.<sup>2</sup> Under the facts of this case, the Court finds that it would be inappropriate to entertain Movants’ motion.

For the reasons stated, Movants’ motion is denied.

S/ Dennis M. Cavanaugh  
Dennis M. Cavanaugh, U.S.D.J.

Date: November 5, 2009  
Orig.: Clerk’s Office  
cc: All Counsel of Record  
The Honorable Mark Falk, U.S.M.J.  
File

---

<sup>1</sup> See Movants’ Motion at 4; Movants’ Brief in Support of Motion at 6.

<sup>2</sup> Wortham v. KarstadtQuelle AG, 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 22715 at \*21 (3d Cir. Oct. 20, 2005) (unpublished); United States v. Alkaabi, 223 F. Supp. 2d 583, 592 (D.N.J. 2002).